

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/452,421	12/01/1999	FELIX G.T.I. ANDREW	202266	1298
7590	07/27/2004		EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON CHICAGO, IL 606016780			DAS, CHAMELI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2122	
			DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/452,421	ANDREW ET AL.	
	Examiner CHAMELI C. DAS	Art Unit 2122	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 20,26-32 and 37-48 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 20,26-32 and 37-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 5/25/04.
2. Claims 1-19 and 21-25, 33-36 have been canceled.
3. Claims 20, 26-32, 37 have been amended.
4. Claims 38-48 have been added.
5. Claims 20, 26-32, 37-48 have been rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claims 28-45, 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 28, in line 11, the limitation, "restricting the first user from accessing and modifying source code for the application program" is unclear because in the previous claim 20, recites the limitation that "first group of system users responsible for writing computer software code". So claims 20 and claim 28 are not consistent.

The examiner interprets the limitation of claim 28, as " restricting the second user from accessing and modifying source code for the application program".

Similarly, in claim 29, the limitation, "restricting a second user form accessing and modifying the one or more resource files" is unclear because the previous claim 20, recites the limitation that "second group of system users responsible for modifying one or more external resource files". So claims 20 and claim 29 are not consistent.

The examiner interprets the limitation of claim 29, as “ restricting the first user from accessing and modifying source code for the application program”.

Similarly, claims 20 and claim 31are not consistent.

Similarly, claims 37-45 are rejected because the limitations are not consistent with the limitations of the previous claims.

The rejection of the base claims are necessarily incorporated into their dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 20, 26-32, 37-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madison, Jr. et al, US 5,887,139 and further in view of Anderson et al, US 5,577,250 and Orenshteyn, US 6,393,569.

As per claim 20, Madison discloses:

- a computer software application development system having a graphical control locator for locating the one or more external resource (Abstract, lines 1-18,col 1, lines 57-63, col7, lines 1-7)

Art Unit: 2122

- parser for identifying a requested parameter stored in the one or more external resource files (col 1, lines 30-37, col 5, lines 13-47)
- external resource files written in markup language (col 4, lines 37-45).

Madison discloses resource file is physically distinct from the user interface application (col 1, lines 57-63). Madison does not specifically disclose first group of system users responsible for writing computer software code and a second group of system users responsible for modifying one or more resource file.

However, Anderson discloses:

- a first group of system users responsible for writing computer software code (col 2, lines 50-57, col 4, lines 56-65, col 3, lines 19-24, col 6, lines 64-67, and Figure 5), where coprocessor program developer is the first group of system users
- a second group of system users responsible for modifying one or more resource files (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50).

The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to implement an environment where careful attention is paid to the division of labor .

As per claim 26, Anderson discloses two group of worker. Neither Madison nor Anderson disclose the second group cannot access the code directly without authorization. However, Orensthteyn discloses the second group cannot access the

Art Unit: 2122

code directly without authorization (Orensthteyn, abstract, col 1, lines 10-20, col 3, lines 10-25, col 6, lines 20-30). (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50).

The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide security in the system.

As per claim 27, Anderson discloses two group of worker. Neither Madison nor Anderson disclose the first group cannot access the one or more external resource without authorization. However, Orensthteyn discloses the first group cannot access the one or more external resource without authorization. (Orensthteyn, abstract, col 1, lines 10-20, col 3, lines 10-25, col 6, lines 20-30). (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50).

The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide security in the system.

As per claim 28,

- creating one or more external resource files for storing data in a markup language for implementing resources (Madison, abstract, lines 14-18, col 4, lines 37-44, col 5, lines 13-16)
- using a graphical control locator ... for a resource (col 7, lines 1-7)
- modify the one or more resource files and execute an application program associated with the one or more resource file (col 2, lines 48-55, col 4, lines 35-40, col 5, lines 59-63).

Neither Madison nor Anderson discloses security, access authority and restricting the users to access the systems. However, Orensthteyn discloses security, access authority and restricting the users to access the systems. (Orensthteyn ,abstract, col 1, lines 10-20, col 3, lines 10-25, col 6, lines 20-30). (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide efficient security in the system.

For claim 29, (Orensthteyn ,abstract, col 1, lines 10-20, col 3, lines 10-25, col 6, lines 20-30). (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50).

For claim 30, (Madison, abstract)

For claim 31 (Orensthteyn ,abstract, col 1, lines 10-20, col 3, lines 10-25, col 6, lines 20-30). (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50).

For claim 32, (Orensthteyn, col 10, lines 45-55).

Claim 37 is rejected for the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 28 above.

For claim 38, (Orensthteyn, col 10, lines 45-55).

For claims 39 and 40, (Orensthteyn ,abstract, col 1, lines 10-20, col 3, lines 10-25, col 6, lines 20-30). (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50).

Claim 41, (Madison, abstract).

Claims 42-45 ((Orensthteyn ,abstract, col 1, lines 10-20, col 3, lines 10-25, col 6, lines 20-30). (col 2, lines 50-57, col 9, lines 10-50, col 10, lines 45-55)).

Claims 46-48, (Madison, col 5, lines 59-66, col 6 lines 1-10).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. The prior art made or record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

TITLE: Dynamically updating themes for an operating system shell US 5905492 A .

TITLE: System and method for retrieval of hyperlinked information resources, US 5855015 A.

TITLE: Method and apparatus for implementing universal resource locator menus, US 5983245 A.

TITLE: Method and apparatus for tracking client interaction with a network resource downloaded from a server, US 6763386 B2.

TITLE: System and method for a directory service supporting a hybrid communication system architecture, US 6754181 B1.

TITLE: System, method and computer program product for web-based integrated circuit design, US 6742165 B2.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is (703) 305-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 A.M to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 703-305-4552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 (official fax).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600.

Chameli C. Das

CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/18/04